arXiv:1609.01651v2 [math.DG] 29 Sep 2016

INDEX CHARACTERIZATION FOR FREE BOUNDARY MINIMAL SURFACES

HUNG TRAN

Abstract. In this paper, we compute the Morse index for a free boundary minimal submanifold from data of two simpler problems. The first one is the corresponding problem with fixed boundary condition; and the second is associated with the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for Jacobi fields. As an application, we show that the Morse index of a free boundary minimal annulus is equal to 4 if and only if it is the critical catenoid.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Notation and Preliminaries 4
2.1. Fixed Boundary Problem 5
2.2. Dirichlet-to-Neumann map 6
2.3. FBMS in a ball 8
3. Index Theorem 11
3.1. Index equal 4 15
4. Free Boundary Minimal Annulus 17
References 22

1. Introduction

This paper is to study the Morse index of a free boundary minimal submanifold (FBMS). Given an orientable manifold Ω^n with boundary $\partial\Omega$, a FBMS is a critical point of the volume functional among all submanifolds with boundaries in $\partial\Omega$. As a consequence, a properly immersed $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ is a FBMS if and only if its mean curvature vanishes and ∂M meets $\partial\Omega$ perpendicularly. The simplest example is an equatorial plane in the unit Euclidean ball. Another simple known example is the critical catenoid with rotational symmetry; see Section 4.

Due to that intriguingly geometrical combination of minimality and boundary orthogonality, the subject has attracted widespread interest which can be traced back to [13, 25]. Several existence results were obtained by different methods including various minimax constructions, varifold theory, minimizing Dirichlet functional, maximizing first Steklov eigenvalue, and differential topology; see [5, 22, 28, 29, 32, 14, 19, 21, 11, 12] and references therein. Also extensive research was aimed to understand the boundary regularity; see for instance [18, 17, 16, 15] (also [7, Chapter 2] is an excellent survey). Roughly speaking, when $\partial\Omega$ is smooth

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 49Q05.

enough, the boundary of a FBMS is as smooth as $\partial\Omega$. In particular, if $\partial\Omega$ is real analytic then Σ is real analytic and can be continued analytically across the boundary.

Recently, the subject has gained even more popularity due to a new perspective related to extremal metrics for Steklov eigenvalues, primarily due to the work of A. Fraser and R. Schoen [9, 10, 11]. As this concept is important to our approach, let us explain it.

The Steklov eigenvalues are associated with harmonic extension for functions on the boundary. Given $h \in C^\infty(\partial\Sigma)$, we consider the problem:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\hat{h} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \hat{h} = h & \text{on } \partial\Sigma. \end{cases}$$

The Dirichlet-to-Neumann map associated with the Laplacian,

$$L_\Delta : C^\infty(\partial M) \mapsto C^\infty(\partial M),$$

is given by

$$L_\Delta h = \frac{\partial\hat{h}}{\partial\eta}. \tag{1.1}$$

It is well known that Δ is an elliptic self-adjoint operator and that the harmonic extension has a unique solution. As a consequence, L_Δ is a non-negative self-adjoint operator with discrete spectrum $0 = \delta_0 < \delta_1 \leq \delta_2 \leq ...$ tending to infinity. The elements of the spectrum are called Steklov eigenvalues.

In connection with our earlier discussion, when Ω is an Euclidean ball, the coordinate functions of a FBMS are eigenfunctions with Steklov eigenvalue 1. That explains the analogy between a FBMS and a minimal submanifold of $\mathbb{S}^n$ in which the coordinate functions are also eigenfunctions of the Laplacian.

Our main focus here is to better understand the Morse index, which intuitively gives the number of distinct admissible deformations which decrease the volume to second order. The motivation is from the analogy to minimal submanifolds in a sphere, where remarkable results have been obtained recently. For minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{S}^3$, due to J. Simons [26], the index is at least 1 and equality happens only for the totally geodesic immersion. Then a non-totally geodesic minimal surface has index at least 5 and, due to F. Urbano [30], the Clifford torus is the only one with that index. What is more, that index characterization plays a key role in the recent celebrated proof of the Willmore conjecture by F. Marques and A. Neves [20].

For a FBMS, less is known. There are restrictions on the topology of a FBMS with low index under some curvature assumptions [23, 4]. Also, we mention recent papers giving lower estimates of the index by topology data [24, 1]. It is likely that those inequalities are not sharp.

If Ω is an Euclidean ball, then the equatorial disk have index 1; see [8] or Remark 3.2. It is conjectured that the critical catenoid is the only FBMS in $\mathbb{B}^3$ with index 4. In this direction, Fraser and Schoen showed that, if $\Sigma^k \subset \mathbb{B}^n$ is not a plane disk, then its index is at least n [11, Theorem 3.1].

This paper takes the following approach. Inspired by the work of Fraser and Schoen [11], we'll reduce the analysis of the Morse index into simpler point-wise

problems, studying variations fixing the boundary and Steklov eigenvalues for Jacobi fields. As an application, we partially address the conjecture above by showing that the catenoid is the only free boundary minimal annulus with index 4.

To describe our results, let us restrict to $n = k + 1$ and Σ is a smooth, properly immersed, and orientable FBMS. Thus Σ is two-sided (when Σ is one-sided one can consider its double cover). Consequently, there exists a smooth unit normal vector field ν and an admissible variation is given by $V = u\nu$ for smooth function u. The second variation of volume of $\Sigma(t)$ at $\Sigma = \Sigma(0)$ is, see [21, Section 2],

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}(u,u) &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathrm{Vol}(\Sigma(t))\mid_{t=0},\\ &= \int_\Sigma |\nabla^\Sigma u|^2 - (\mathrm{Rc}^\Omega(\nu,\nu) + |A|^2)u^2 d\mu - \int_{\partial\Sigma} \left\langle \nabla^\Omega_\nu \eta, \nu \right\rangle u^2 da.\end{aligned}$$

Here the superscripts indicate the context of corresponding operators; $|A|$ is the norm of the second fundamental form of $\Sigma \subset \Omega$; Rc denotes the Ricci tensor; η is the outward conormal vector along $\partial\Sigma$ and is perpendicular to $\partial\Omega$. Therefore,

$$\left\langle \nabla^\Omega_\nu \eta, \nu \right\rangle = -h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu),$$

for $h^{\partial\Omega}(.,.)$ the second fundamental form of $\partial\Omega \subset \Omega$.

Definition 1.1. *The Morse index of $\Sigma^k \subset \Omega^{k+1}$ is the maximal dimension of a subspace of $C^\infty(\Sigma)$ in which the second variation is negative definite. The nullity is the dimension of the space of functions in which the second variation is vanishing.*

Recall the Jacobi operator

$$\mathcal{J} = \Delta_\Sigma + \mathrm{Rc}(\nu,\nu) + |A|^2 \tag{1.2}$$

It is well known, see ([1], [24], [21]), that the index is equal to the number of negative eigenvalues counting multiplicity for the following system,

$$\begin{cases} (\Delta_g + \mathrm{Rc}(\nu,\nu) + |A|^2)u = \mathcal{J}u = -\lambda u & \text{on } \Sigma,\\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} = -h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu)u & \text{on } \partial\Sigma. \end{cases}$$

If we restrict to variations fixing the boundary then the boundary integral disappears. That leads to the following system:

$$(*)\begin{cases} \mathcal{J}u = -\lambda u & \text{on } \Sigma,\\ u \equiv 0 & \text{on } \partial\Sigma. \end{cases}$$

The number of negative eigenvalues for (*) is generally smaller than the Morse index because of the boundary condition. The influence of the boundary is then analyzed by the following Dirichlet-to-Neumann map in terms of Jacobi fields.

Given a function $h \in C^\infty(\partial\Sigma)$, consider the Jacobi extension of h:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{J}\hat{h} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma,\\ \hat{h} = h & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

Associated is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map (see Subsection 2.2)

$$L'_{\mathcal{J}} h = \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial \eta}. \tag{1.3}$$

It turns out that $L'_{\mathcal{J}}$ has a discrete spectrum tending to infinity.

Our first result characterizes the Morse index and nullity by data from the corresponding problem with fixed boundary and the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for Jacobi fields.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Sigma^k \subset \Omega^{k+1}$ be a smooth, properly immersed, orientable FBMS such that $h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu) = -c$. Then, we have:*

- *The Morse index is equal to, counting multiplicities, the number of non-positive eigenvalues of (*) and eigenvalues less than c of (1.3).*
- *The nullity is equal to the nullity of (*) plus the dimension of eigenspace with eigenvalue c of (1.3).*

Remark 1.1. *It is clear that $\mathcal{S}(.,.)$ is negative on eigenfunctions with negative eigenvalues of (*). Next, if $\hat{h}$ is a Jacobi extension of h such that $L'_{\mathcal{J}}\hat{h} = \lambda h$ for $\lambda < c$ then*

$$\mathcal{S}(\hat{h},\hat{h}) = (\lambda - c)\int_{\partial\Sigma} h^2 < 0.$$

The crucial non-triviality in the proof is that eigen-functions with eigenvalue 0 of (*) can be modified to give negative deformations, see Lemma 3.3.

As an application, we give a partial index characterization for the critical catenoid.

Theorem 1.3. *The critical catenoid in $\mathbb{B}^3$ has Morse index 4 and nullity 3. Conversely, a free boundary minimal annulus in $\mathbb{B}^3$ with index 4 must be the catenoid.*

Remark 1.2. *We learned the converse statement from Richard Schoen's lecture in 2015. Upon completion of this paper, it comes to our attention that catenoid having index 4 is independently proved by B. Devyver* [6] *and G. Smith and D. Zhou* [27] *by different methods. Also some results of Subsection 3.1 are independently observed by B. Devyver and A. Fraser* [6].

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 collects notation and preliminaries. Then we give the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Section 3. We also discuss generalization and estimates when $h^{\partial\Sigma}(\nu,\nu)$ is not a constant. Finally, the computation for the critical catenoid is carried out in Section 4.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to thank Richard Schoen for inspiring lectures and extensive discussion. The author has also benefited greatly from conversations with Xiaodong Cao, David Wiygul, and Peter McGrath.

2. Notation and Preliminaries

This section collects notation and preliminary results that will be used throughout the paper.

We adopt the following setting:

- Σ^k is a smooth, orientable, properly immersed FBMS with boundary $\partial\Sigma$ in the smooth orientable manifold Ω^{k+1} with boundary $\partial\Omega$. We note that if Ω is simply connected then the orientability of Σ is automatic.
- In case $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^{k+1}$, the unit Euclidean ball, X denotes the position vector.
- η denotes the outward conormal vector along the boundary (which is the same as X for a FBMS in $\mathbb{B}^{k+1}$).
- ν is a choice of normal vector to the surface such that, in an Euclidean ball and Σ not equatorial, $\zeta = \langle X, \nu\rangle$ is positive at some point.

- The second fundamental form is defined as, for unit orthogonal vector fields $e_i, e_j \in T\Sigma$,
$$h_{ij} = \left\langle \nabla^{\Omega}_{e_i} e_j, \nu \right\rangle = - \left\langle \nabla^{\Omega}_{e_i} \nu, e_j \right\rangle .$$
In particular, for the sphere $\mathbb{S}^k \subset \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, $h^{\mathbb{S}^k}_{ij} = -g_{ij}$. The mean curvature is just the trace and $|A|$ denotes the norm of the second fundamental form.
- For a fixed vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $X_a = \langle X, a \rangle$, $\nu_a = \langle \nu, a \rangle$.
- $\mathcal{W}^1(.)$ denotes the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(.)$. $\mathcal{W}^1_0(.)$ denotes the subspace of functions which vanish at the boundary. $C^{\infty}(.)$ and $C^{\infty}_0(.)$ are analogous spaces of smooth functions.
- $\vec{0}$ denotes the function which is trivially zero everywhere.
- We'll drop the volume form when the context is clear.

Recall the bilinear form associated with the second variation for a FBMS $\Sigma^k \subset \Omega^{k+1}$, for $h, f \in \mathbb{C}^{\infty}(\Sigma)$,

$$\mathcal{S}(f,h) = \int_{\Sigma} \nabla f \nabla h - (\mathrm{Rc}(\nu,\nu) + |A|^2) fh + \int_{\partial\Sigma} h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu) fh. \tag{2.1}$$

That gives motivation for the following:

Definition 2.1. *Given $\phi, m \in C^{\infty}(\Sigma)$ such that $\phi \geq \epsilon > 0$ and a constant α, we define:*

$$J = \nabla(\phi\nabla) + m; \tag{2.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(h,f) &= \int_{\Sigma} \phi \nabla f \nabla h - mfh, \\ S(h,f) &= \int_{\Sigma} \phi \nabla f \nabla h - mfh - \alpha \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi fh \\ &= Q(h,f) - \alpha \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi fh. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3, 2.4}$$

The choice of J is such that,

$$\int_{\Sigma} hJf - fJh = - \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi(fD_{\eta}h - hD_{\eta}f).$$

Consequently, we define the Morse index and nullity associated with $S(.,.)$ as follows.

Definition 2.2. *The Morse index with respect to the bilinear form $S(.,.)$ is the maximal dimension of a subspace of $C^{\infty}(\Sigma)$ in which $S(.,.)$ is negative definite. The nullity is the dimension of the space of functions in which $S(.,.)$ is vanishing.*

2.1. **Fixed Boundary Problem.** If we restrict to variations fixing the boundary then the boundary integral in (2.1) disappears. Similarly, to understand the Morse index of $S(.,.)$, we first consider functions vanishing at the boundary. That is relevant to studying operator J with Dirichlet boundary condition.

As $\phi \geq \epsilon > 0$, it follows immediately that J is a differential, elliptic, and self-adjoint operator with compact resolvent. In particular, by the spectral theorem, J has a discrete spectrum that goes to infinity. Each eigenvalue and eigenfunction

satisfy the following system,

$$\begin{aligned} Ju + \lambda u &= 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

The eigenvalue λ can be characterized by min-max principle, for V_k any k-dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{W}_0^1(\Sigma)$.

$$\lambda_k(J) = \min_{V_k \subset \mathcal{W}_0^1} \max_{u \in V_k} \frac{Q(u,u)}{\int_\Sigma u^2}. \tag{2.6}$$

Definition 2.3. *Let $W_0^-(W_0^0)$ denote the space of eigenfunctions with negative (zero) eigenvalues for (2.5). The dimension of W_0^0 is the nullity of (2.5).*

We note that each space above is finite dimensional. As a consequence, the following notion will be crucial in later analysis.

Definition 2.4. *When the nullity is non-zero, let $\{w^i,\ i = 1, .., dim(W_0^0))\}$ be a basis of W_0^0. We define,*

$$B = span(b_i = D_\eta w^i,\ i = 1, .., dim(W_0^0)).$$

Let $K_B \subset C^\infty(\Sigma)$ be the space of all $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that $u_{|\partial\Sigma} \in B$.

Remark 2.1. *It is clear that $dim(B) = dim(W_0^0)$.*

Remark 2.2. *For a FBMS in an Euclidean ball $h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu) \equiv -1$, we can choose $J = \mathcal{J}$, the classical Jacobi operator. The position vector X is harmonic while the normal vector satisfies the Jacobi field equation. Thus, for $\zeta = \langle X, \nu\rangle$,*

$$J\zeta = 0.$$

Furthermore, the free-boundary condition in a ball implies that

$$\zeta_{|\partial\Sigma} = 0.$$

As a consequence, $\zeta \in W_0^0$, so the nullity is non-zero.

2.2. **Dirichlet-to-Neumann map.** Given a function $h \in C^\infty(\partial\Sigma)$, consider the J-extension (Dirichlet problem associated with operator J) of h:

$$\begin{aligned} J\hat{h} &= 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ \hat{h} &= h \text{ on } \partial\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

The following result is well known.

Lemma 2.5. *Given $h \in C^\infty(\partial\Sigma)$, the J-extension exists and is unique up to an addition of $w \in W_0^0$ if and only if, for all $b \in B$,*

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi b h = 0.$$

In other words, $h \in B^\perp \subset C^\infty(\partial\Sigma)$ with respect to the ϕ-weighted L^2 inner product.

Proof. The kernel of J is W_0^0. By the Fredholm alternative, the extension exists if and only if, for any extension $\overline{h}$ of h and any $w \in W_0^0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_\Sigma w J\overline{h}, \\ &= \int_\Sigma \overline{h} J w + \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi(wD_\eta\overline{h} - hD_\eta w), \\ &= -\int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi h D_\eta w. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D_\eta w \in B$ the result follows. □

Definition 2.6. *Let H_J be the space of all functions $h \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that $Jh = 0$ in the interior of Σ.*

Associated with the J-extension is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map,

$$L'_J : L^2(\partial\Sigma, \phi da) \to L^2(\partial\Sigma, \phi da),$$

given by,

$$(L'_J)h = \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial \eta}. \tag{2.7}$$

Remark 2.3. *Since J with Dirichlet boundary condition possibly has non-trivial kernel, L'_J is a possibly multi-valued operator (relation). However, due to the symmetry of the corresponding functional and compactness of the trace operator, the multi-valued operator is self-adjoint with compact resolvent and bounded below; see* [2, Thm 4.5, Prop 4.8, Thm 4.13] *and* [3] *for details.*

In particular, the single-valued part of L'_J, denoted L_J, is a self-adjoint operator with discrete spectrum on the orthogonal complement of B in the sense of Lemma 2.5. The elements in that spectrum are called J-Steklov eigenvalues.

The J-Steklov eigenvalues are characterized variationally as follows, for V_k any k-dimensional subspace of $B^\perp \subset \mathcal{W}^1(\partial\Sigma, \phi da)$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^b(h,h) = Q(\hat{h},\hat{h}) &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi h(L'_J\hat{h}) = S(\hat{h},\hat{h}) + \alpha\int_{\partial\Sigma}\phi h^2, \\ \lambda_k(L_J) &= \min_{V_k \subset B^\perp} \max_{h\in V_k} \frac{Q^b(h,h)}{\int_\Sigma \phi h^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Remark 2.4. *As a consequence, for $L_J\hat{h} = \lambda h$ and $\lambda < \alpha$, $S(\hat{h},\hat{h}) < 0$. Therefore, $J-$Steklov eigenvalues play a role in the analysis of the Morse index.*

In particular, we introduce the following notation.

Definition 2.7. *For a constant c let H^{c-} (H^{c+}) be the space of eigen-functions of L_J with eigenvalues less than (at least) c. Then let $\hat{H}_J^{c\pm}$ be Jacobi extensions mod out the kernel of J. That is,*

$$\hat{H}_J^{c\pm} = \{\hat{h},\ h \in H_J^{c\pm},\ D_\eta\hat{h} \in H_J^{c\pm}\}.$$

Remark 2.5. *Since L_J is bounded below and the spectrum is discrete, H_J^{c-} and $\hat{H}_J^{c-}$ are of the same finite dimension.*

The next result is immediate from the spectral theorem for L_J.

Lemma 2.8. *We have,*

$$H_J = \hat{H}_J^{c-} \oplus \hat{H}_J^{c+} \oplus W_0^0.$$

The direct sum here is with respect to either the ϕ-weighted L^2 inner product $L^2(\partial\Sigma, \phi da)$ or the bilinear form $S(.,.)$.

2.3. **FBMS in a ball.** For a minimal submanifold in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^{k+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Rc}(\nu,\nu) &= 0, \\ h^{\partial\mathbb{B}^{k+1}}(\nu,\nu) &= -1. \end{aligned}$$

So choosing $\phi \equiv 1 = \alpha$, $m = |A|^2$ yield:

$$J = \mathcal{J} = (\Delta + |A|^2).$$

The minimality implies,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta X_a &= 0, \\ \Delta \nu_a &= -|A|^2 \nu_a. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that,

$$(\Delta + |A|^2)\zeta = 0.$$

Similarly, for skew-symmetric matrix $M \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$, the Lie algebra of the rotation group $SO(n)$, then,

$$(\Delta + |A|^2) \langle MX, \nu \rangle = 0.$$

Here, $\langle MX, \nu \rangle$ represents the normal speed corresponding to a rotation determined by M. In $\mathbb{R}^3$, using the cross product $\times$, the infinitesimal normal speed associated with a rotation around a constant vector a is $\langle X \times \nu, a \rangle$.

Next, we investigate the boundary derivative. For a FBMS, X_a is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue 1 for (1.1), see [9, 11] for more details. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\eta X_a &= X_a, \\ 0 &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} X_a. \end{aligned}$$

The free boundary condition also implies that the second fundamental form is diagonalized by X and tangential vectors along the boundary. As a consequence, we have the following computation along $\partial\Sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\eta \nu_a = D_X \langle \nu, a \rangle &= -h(X,X)X_a = -h(\eta,\eta)X_a; \\ D_\eta \zeta = \sum_a \frac{\partial(X_a \nu_a)}{\partial \eta} &= -h(\eta,\eta); \\ D_\eta \langle MX, \nu \rangle &= \langle MX, \nu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

As $J\nu_a = 0 = J\langle MX, \nu \rangle$ and $D_\eta \zeta = -h(X,X)$, it follows immediately that $\nu_a, \langle MX, \nu \rangle \perp B \supset h(X,X)$. That is,

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} h(X,X)\nu_a = 0 = \int_{\partial\Sigma} h(X,X) \langle MX, \nu \rangle.$$

Next, we compute the second variation on components of the normal vector.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\Sigma^k \subset \mathbb{B}^{k+1}$ be a properly immersed FBMS. We have, for a, b constant unit vectors,*

$$S(\nu_a, \nu_b) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} kX_aX_b - \langle a, b\rangle . \tag{2.9}$$

Furthermore, if $a = b$ then,

$$S(\nu_a, \nu_a) = -k\int_\Sigma \nu_a^2.$$

Proof. We compute, for $J\nu_a = J\nu_b = 0$ inside Σ,

$$\begin{aligned} S(\nu_a, \nu_b) &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} \nu_a D_\eta \nu_b - \nu_a\nu_b, \\ &= -\int_{\partial\Sigma} \nu_a h(X, X)X_b + \nu_a\nu_b. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{k-1}$ be an orthogonal frame of $T(\partial\Sigma)$ and $(.)^T$ the tangential part along $\partial\Sigma$ of a vector field. Then, $a = X_aX + \nu_a\nu + a^T$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{div}_{\partial\Sigma}(\nu_a\nu + a^T) &= \mathrm{div}_{\partial\Sigma}(a - X_aX) \\ &= -(k-1)X_a. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{div}_{\partial\Sigma}(\nu_a\nu + a^T) &= \mathrm{div}_{\partial\Sigma}(a^T) + \sum_i \nu_a \langle \nabla_{e_i}\nu, e_i\rangle , \\ &= \mathrm{div}_{\partial\Sigma}(a^T) - \sum_i \nu_a h(e_i, e_i) = \mathrm{div}_{\partial\Sigma}(a^T) + \nu_a h(\eta, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\Sigma} \nu_a D_\eta \nu_b &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} X_b(\mathrm{div}_{\partial\Sigma}(a^T) + (k-1)X_a) \\ &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} (k-1)X_aX_b - \int_{\partial\Sigma} a^Tb^T. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} S(\nu_a, \nu_b) &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} \nu_a D_\eta \nu_b - \nu_a\nu_b, \\ &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} (k-1)X_aX_b - \int_{\partial\Sigma} (\langle a^T, b^T\rangle + \nu_a\nu_b) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} kX_aX_b - \langle a, b\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

When $a = b$, we consider vector field $V = X - kX_aa$ and by the Stokes' theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Sigma \mathrm{div}(V) &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} \langle X, V\rangle , \\ \int_\Sigma k\nu_a^2 &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} (1 - kX_a^2) = -S(\nu_a, \nu_a). \end{aligned}$$

That concludes the proof. □

A consequence is the following.

Corollary 2.10. *Let $\Sigma^k \subset \mathbb{B}^{k+1}$ be a properly immersed FBMS. Suppose Σ is not equatorial, then*

$$dim(H_J^{1-}) \geq k + 1.$$

Proof. Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{k+1}$ be a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$. By Lemma 2.9, for $V = \text{span}(\nu_1, ..., \nu_{k+1}) \subset H_J$, $S(.,.)$ is negative definite on V. Also $\dim(V) = k+1$ (otherwise, there is a constant vector a such that $\nu_a = 0$, implying Σ be equatorial).

By (2.8), for $h = \nu_a|_{\partial\Sigma}$,

$$S(\nu_a, \nu_a) + ||h||^2_{L^2(\partial\Sigma)} = Q^b(h,h) < ||h||^2_{L^2(\partial\Sigma)}.$$

The result then follows. □

We also observe a preliminary estimate for the first eigenvalue of L_J.

Proposition 2.11. *Let λ_1 be the first eigenvalue of L_J. Then,*

$$\lambda_1 \leq 0.$$

Equality happens if Σ is flat.

Proof. We compute, as in Lemma 2.9,

$$S(\nu_i, \nu_i) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} kX_i^2 - 1,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} S(\nu_i, \nu_i) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} (k - (k+1)) = -L(\partial\Sigma).$$

Each ν_i is a Jacobi field and its projection on W_0^0 contributes nothing to $S(\nu_i, \nu_i)$. Therefore,

$$S(\nu_i, \nu_i) \geq (\lambda_1 - 1) \int_{\partial\Sigma} \nu_i^2;$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} S(\nu_i, \nu_i) \geq (\lambda_1 - 1) L(\partial\Sigma).$$

Combining those equations yields that $\lambda_1 \leq 0$.

Now if the FBMS is flat then $|A|^2 = 0$. The Jacobi operator reduces to the regular Laplacian and so the result follows. In this case, ν is a constant vector. □

There is a partial result in the reverse direction. We first observe the following:

Lemma 2.12. *Let $\Sigma^k \subset \mathbb{B}^{k+1}$ be a properly immersed FBMS with ζ positive everywhere inside Σ. Then the first eigenvalue for the fixed boundary problem is 0. In particular, $W_0^- = \emptyset$ and $W_0^0 = span(\zeta)$.*

Proof. By the variation characterization of the first eigenvalue of the fixed boundary problem (2.6), the first eigenfunction is positive inside Σ and the corresponding eigenspace has dimension 1. The result then follows. □

Remark 2.6. *If Σ is star-shaped, or equivalently a polar graph, then the assumption on ζ is justified.*

Proposition 2.13. *Let $\Sigma^k \subset \mathbb{B}^{k+1}$ be a properly immersed FBMS with $\lambda_1(L_J) = 0$ and ζ positive everywhere inside then it must be an equatorial hyper-plane.*

Proof. If $\lambda_1 = 0$ then equality happens in each estimate in the proof of Prop. 2.11. Thus, each ν_i has a decomposition such that,

- $\nu_i = c_i w_i + v_i$;

- $w_i \in W_0^0$;
- $v_i \in \hat{H}_1$ and $L_J v_i = 0$.

Since ζ is positive everywhere inside, by Lemma 2.12, $W_0^0 = \text{span}\{\zeta\}$. Consequently, $w_i = \zeta$. Thus, we have the following equation along the boundary,

$$\begin{aligned} -h(X,X)X_i &= D_\eta \nu_i, \\ &= D_\eta(c_i\zeta + v_i) = c_i h(X,X). \end{aligned}$$

If $|A|$ is non-zero except for a set of measure zero along the boundary then each X_i is a constant almost everywhere, a contradiction. Therefore, $|A|$ vanishes on a positive measure set. As a FBMS is real analytic, $|A|$ must vanish everywhere and so Σ must be an equatorial hyper-plane. □

Corollary 2.14. *Let $\Sigma^2 \subset \mathbb{B}^3$ be a properly immersed FBMS genus 0. Suppose it has first Steklov eigenvalue 1 and first Jacobi Steklov eigenvalue 0 then it must be an equatorial hyper-plane.*

Proof. By [11, Prop 8.1], genus 0 and first Steklov 1 imply star-shaped. So the statement follows from Prop. 2.13. □

3. Index Theorem

In this section, we relate the index and nullity of $S(.,.)$ by data of the fixed boundary problem 2.5 and J-Steklov eigenvalues. Also, orthogonal decomposition is with respect to $S(.,.)$ unless stated otherwise.

Recall K_B as in Definition 2.4 and observe the following.

Lemma 3.1. *We have the following orthogonal decomposition with respect to the bi-linear form $S(.,.)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C^\infty(\Sigma) &= K_B \oplus H'; \\ H' &= \hat{H}_J^{c-} \oplus \hat{H}_J^{c+}; \\ K_B &= W_0^- \oplus X. \end{aligned}$$

Here X is just the orthogonal complement of W_0^- in K_B.

Proof. For any function $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$, $u_{|\partial\Sigma} = b + h$ for $b \in B$ and $h \perp B$ with respect to $L^2(\partial\Sigma, \phi da)$.

By Lemma 2.5, h has an extension $\hat{h} \in H$. Let $h_0 \in W_0^0$ such that $\partial_\eta(h - h_0) \perp B$. By Lemma 2.8, $h' = \hat{h} - h_0 \in \hat{H}_J^{c-} \oplus \hat{H}_J^{c+}$. Then, for $w = u - h'$, $w \in K_B$, $w_{|\partial\Sigma} = b$,

$$\begin{aligned} S(w,h') &= \int_\Sigma \phi \nabla w \nabla h' - mwh' - \alpha \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi w h, \\ &= \int_\Sigma -wJh' + \int_{\partial\Sigma} (\partial_\eta h' - \alpha h)\phi b, \\ &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} b\phi \partial_\eta h', \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows because $\partial_\eta h' = \partial_\eta(h - h_0) \perp B$.

The second decomposition is just a recollection of Lemma 2.8. The third is a standard linear algebra decomposition. □

Remark 3.1. *$X = (W_0^-)^\perp \subset K_B$ is an infinite dimensional vector space which includes W_0^0 as a subspace.*

We observe the following properties of X. First, let's define a linear map:

Definition 3.2. *Let $T : X \mapsto W_0^0$ such that, for $u \in X \subset K_B$,*

- *$Tu = \vec{0}$ if $u_{|\partial\Sigma} = \vec{0}$,*
- *$Tu = w$ for $D_\eta w = u_{|\partial\Sigma}$.*

Lemma 3.3. *For each $u \in X$ let $w = Tu \in W_0^0$ and $W = T^{-1}(span(w)) \subset X$.*

a. *If $w = \vec{0}$ then $S(.,.)$ is non-negative definite on W.*
b. *If $w \neq \vec{0}$ then $S(.,.)$ restricted to W has index exactly equal to 1.*

Proof. We argue as follows.

a. If $w = \vec{0}$ then $u_{|\partial\Sigma} = \vec{0}$ and $u \perp W_0^-$ with respect to $S(.,.)$ by the definition of X. That is, for $h \in W_0^-$, $Jh = -\lambda h$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = S(u,h) &= \int_\Sigma \phi \nabla u \nabla h - muh - \alpha \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi uh \\ &= \int_\Sigma -uJh + \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi u(D_\eta h - \alpha h) \\ &= \int_\Sigma \lambda uh. \end{aligned}$$

Since each $\lambda \neq 0$, $u \perp W_0^-$ with respect to $L^2(\Sigma)$. So the statement follows from the min-max characterization of eigenvalues of (2.5).

b. For $Tu = w \in W_0^0$ and any constant c, $T(u + cw) = w$ since

$$(u + cw)_{|\partial\Sigma} = u_{|\partial\Sigma} = D_\eta w.$$

Thus, $u + cw \in W$. So we compute,

$$\begin{aligned} S(u + cw, u + cw) &= S(u,u) + c^2 S(w,w) + 2cS(u,w), \\ &= S(u,u) + 2c \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi u(D_\eta w), \\ &= S(u,u) + 2c \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi u^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since it is possible to choose c to make the expression negative, the index of $S(.,.)$ restricted to W is at least one.

To show that the index is exactly equal to 1, let $W' \subset W$ be a maximal space in which $S(.,.)$ is negative definite. Suppose $\dim(W') \geq 2$ then there exists orthogonal functions $u, v \in W' \subset W$ such that

$$u_{|\partial\Sigma} = kv_{|\partial\Sigma} = D_\eta w.$$

Therefore,

$$(u - kv)_{|\partial\Sigma} = w - w = \vec{0}.$$

By the previous part, $S(u - kv, u - kv) \geq 0$. As $\vec{0} \neq u - kv \in W'$, there is a contradiction to the definition of W'. Thus, the statement follows. □

Now we are ready to characterize the Morse index of $S(.,.)$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold with boundary. Given $\phi, m \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that $\phi > 0$ and a constant α, the Morse index for $S(.,.)$ is equal to*

$$dim(W_0^0) + dim(W_0^-) + dim(H_J^{\alpha-}).$$

Also any maximal space, on which $S(.,.)$ is negative definite, is isomorphic by projection to $\hat{H}_J^{a-} \oplus W_0^- \oplus U$ constructed in Prop. 3.5.

The proof is divided into Prop. 3.5 and Prop. 3.6 below.

Proposition 3.5. *The Morse index of $S(.,.)$ is at least:*

$$dim(W_0^0) + dim(W_0^-) + dim(H_0^{\alpha-}).$$

Proof. The idea is to construct a space of that dimension in which $S(.,.)$ is negative definite.

Recall that,

$$C^\infty(\Sigma) = \hat{H}_J^{c-} \oplus \hat{H}_J^{c+} \oplus W_0^- \oplus X,$$

for any constant c and the direct sum is with respect to $S(.,.)$. From the construction, see Definitions 2.3 and 2.7 and also equation (2.8), it is clear that $S(.,.)$ is negative definite on W_0^- and $\hat{H}_J^{\alpha-}$.

By Lemma 3.3, a function $u \in X$ gives rise to an one-dimensional subspace on which $S(.,.)$ is negative definite. And the construction is solely dependent on the boundary value of that function, $u_{|\partial\Sigma} = D_\eta w$ for $w \in W_0^0$, and independent of W_0^- and $H_J^{\alpha-}$. So we expect $\dim(W_0^0)$ additional independent deformations.

Here is the precise construction. For each $b_i \in B$, see (2.4), let b_i' be an extension such that $b_i' \in X \perp W_0^-$. Since each bilinear form, the $\phi-$weighted L^2 inner product or $S(.,.)$, is symmetric, there is a set of functions denoted by the same notation b_i', $i = 1, ..., N = \dim(B) = \dim(W_0^0)$ such that,

- $b_i' \in X$.
- $\int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi b_i' b_j' = \delta_{ij}$.
- $S(b_i', b_j') = 0$ if $i \neq j$.

By Lemma 3.3, for each b_i' we could choose $u_i = b_i' + c_i w_i \in X$, such that

- $w_i \in W_0^0$;
- $u_i = b_i' = D_\eta w_i$ on $\partial\Sigma$;
- $S(u_i, u_i) < 0$.

Claim: $S(.,.)$ is negative definite on $U = \text{span}(u_1, ...u_N)$.
Proof of the claim: We compute, for $i \neq j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
S(u_i, u_j) &= S(b_i' + c_i w_i, b_j' + c_j w_j), \\
&= S(b_i', b_j') + c_i S(w_i, b_j') + c_j S(w_j, b_i') + c_i c_j S(w_i, w_j), \\
&= S(b_i', b_j') + c_i \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi(D_\eta w_i) b_j' + c_j \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi(D_\eta w_j) b_i', \\
&= S(b_i', b_j') + (c_i + c_j) \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi b_i' b_j', \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the claim follows.

By Lemma 3.1 and $U \subset X$, $S(.,.)$ is negative definite on $W = U \oplus W_0^0 \oplus H_J^{\alpha-}$. Clearly, $\dim(U) = \dim(B) = \dim(W_0^0)$ so the statement follows. □

Proposition 3.6. *The Morse index of $S(.,.)$ is at most:*

$$dim(W_0^0) + dim(W_0^-) + dim(H_J^{\alpha-}).$$

Proof. Let $W = U \oplus W_0^0 \oplus H_J^{\alpha-}$ as in Prop. 3.5 and W' be a maximal subspace of $C^\infty(\Sigma)$ in which $S(.,.)$ is negative definite. Suppose $\dim(W') > \dim(W)$.

We consider the projection of W' to W, $P = \text{Proj}_W^S(W')$, with respect to the bilinear symmetric form $S(.,.)$.

Claim: $P = W$. In other words, the projection is onto.

Proof of claim: If not then there exists a non-trivial function u such that,

- $u \in W$,
- $S(u, w') = 0$ for any $w' \in W'$.

It follows immediately that $S(.,.)$ is negative definite on $W' \oplus \text{span}(u)$, a contradiction to the maximality of W'. Thus the claim follows.

Next, by the dimension theorem, the kernel is non-trivial.

Let μ be in the kernel then we have:

- For any $w \in W$, $S(\mu, w) = 0$,
- $S(\mu, \mu) < 0$.

By Lemma 3.1 and $\mu \perp W = W_0^- \oplus \hat{H}_J^{\alpha-} \oplus U$, $\mu = v + h$ such that,

- $v \in X = (W_0^-)^\perp \subset K_B$ and $h \in \hat{H}_J^{\alpha+}$,
- $v \perp U$ with respect to $S(.,.)$. In other words, $S(u, v) = 0$ for any $u \in U$.

Claim: $S(v, v) \geq 0$.

Proof of the claim: Since $v \in X \subset K_B$, $v_{|\partial\Sigma} \in B$. If $v_{|\partial\Sigma} = \vec{0}$, then the claim follows from Lemma 3.3(Part a). Otherwise, there is $u \in U$ such that $u = v$ on $\partial\Sigma$. By the same argument as in Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq S(u - v, u - v), \\ &= S(u, u) + S(v, v) - 2S(u, v), \\ &= S(u, u) + S(v, v) < S(v, v). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows because $S(u, u) < 0$. So the claim follows.

Furthermore, $S(h, h) \geq 0$ by the variational characterization for $H_J^{\alpha+}$ and (2.8). By Lemma 3.1, $S(h, v) = 0$. Putting everything together, we have,

$$S(\mu, \mu) = S(h + v, h + v) = S(h, h) + S(w, w) \geq 0.$$

That is a contradiction to the fact that μ is in a space on which $S(.,.)$ is negative definite. Therefore, $\dim(W') \leq \dim(W)$. □

The same method as above also yields the computation of the nullity for $S(.,.)$.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold with boundary. Given that $\phi, m \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that $\phi > 0$ and a constant α, the nullity of $S(.,.)$ is equal to the nullity of (2.5) plus the dimension of eigen-space of L_J with eigenvalue α.*

Now Theorem 1.2 follows as a consequence.

Proof. For a FBMS and $h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu) = c$ we could choose,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= c,\\ \phi &\equiv 1,\\ m &= (\mathrm{Rc}(\nu,\nu) + |A|^2).\end{aligned}$$

Then, $J = \mathcal{J}$ and $S(.,.) = \mathcal{S}(.,.)$ and the result follows from Theorems 3.4 and 3.7. □

Remark 3.2. *For an equatorial hyper-plane in a ball, the Jacobi operator becomes the Laplacian. So we immediately recover the result that the it has Morse index 1.*

When $h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu)$ is not a constant we let

$$\begin{aligned}a_I &= \inf_{\partial\Sigma} h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu),\\ a_S &= \sup_{\partial\Sigma} h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu).\end{aligned}$$

Let ϕ be the harmonic extension of $h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu)$ then, immediately, $a_I \le \phi \le a_S$. We define the following, for $x \in \{I, S\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}m_x &= a_x(\mathrm{Rc}(\nu,\nu) + |A|^2);\\ Q_x(h,f) &= \int_\Sigma \phi\nabla f\nabla h - m_x fh,\\ S_x(h,f) &= \int_\Sigma \phi\nabla f\nabla h - m_x fh - a_x\int_{\partial\Sigma}\phi fh\\ &= Q_x(h,f) - a_x\int_{\partial\Sigma}\phi fh.\end{aligned}$$

We observe,

$$\begin{aligned}a_I\mathcal{S}(u,u) &= \int_\Sigma a_I|\nabla u|^2 - m_I u^2 - a_I\int_{\partial\Sigma} u^2,\\ &\le S_I(u,u),\\ a_S\mathcal{S}(u,u) &= \int_\Sigma a_S|\nabla u|^2 - m_S u^2 - a_S\int_{\partial\Sigma} u^2,\\ &\ge S_S(u,u),\end{aligned}$$

So we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.8. *Let $\Sigma^k \in \Omega^{k+1}$ be a FBMS such that $0 < a_I \le h^{\partial\Omega}(\nu,\nu) \le a_S$. Then the Morse index of Σ is bounded between the Morse indices of $S_I(.,.)$ and $S_S(.,.)$ defined above.*

3.1. **Index equal 4.** By Theorem 3.4 and 2.10, the index of any non-equatorial submanifolds in $\mathbb{B}^{k+1}$ is at least $k+2$. In this section, we consider a critical case, a FBMS in $\mathbb{B}^3$ with index 4. This is analogous to the situation of a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{S}^3$ with index 5.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $\Sigma^2 \subset \mathbb{B}^3$ be a properly immersed FBMS with Morse index 4 then the first Steklov eigenvalue is 1.*

Proof. First Σ can not be an equator because of Remark 3.2.

Suppose the first Steklov eigenvalue $\lambda_1 < 1$ and let u be an eigenfunction associated with that eigenvalue. That is,

$$\Delta u = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma,$$
$$D_\eta u = \lambda_1 u \text{ on } \partial\Sigma.$$

Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^3$ of $\mathbb{R}^3$; then each X_i is an eigenfunction with Steklov eigenvalue 1. Let $V = \text{span}(u, X_1, X_2, X_3, \underline{1})$ in which $\underline{1}$ is the function constantly equal to 1. All these functions are eigenfunctions with Steklov eigenvalues $\lambda_1, 1, 0$ respectively. Also, because Σ is not equatorial, $\dim(V) = 5$.

Next we'll show that $S(.,.)$ is negative definite on V. For any $\vec{0} \neq v \in V$, there exist a constant vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and constant numbers c, d (not all trivial) such that,

$$v = X_a + cu + d.$$

We compute,

$$\begin{aligned}
S(v,v) &= \int_\Sigma \nabla v \nabla v - |A|^2 v^2 - \int_{\partial\Sigma} v^2, \\
&= \int_\Sigma -v(\Delta + |A|^2)v + \int_{\partial\Sigma} (D_\eta v - v)v, \\
&= \int_\Sigma -|A|^2 v^2 + \int_{\partial\Sigma} (X_a + c\lambda_1 u - X_a - cu - d)v, \\
&= \int_\Sigma -|A|^2 v^2 + \int_{\partial\Sigma} \Big((\lambda_1 - 1)cu - d\Big)(X_a + cu + d), \\
&= \int_\Sigma -|A|^2 v^2 + \int_{\partial\Sigma} (\lambda_1 - 1)c^2 u^2 - d^2 < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $S(.,.)$ is negative-definite on V and so its Morse index is at least 5, a contradiction. Therefore, $\lambda_1 = 1$. □

Proposition 3.10. *Let $\Sigma^2 \subset \mathbb{B}^3$ be a properly immersed FBMS with Morse index 4 then $\zeta = \langle X, \nu \rangle$ is positive everywhere inside. In particular, Σ is stable with respect to variations fixing the boundary.*

Proof. As observed before, ζ is an eigenfunction for the problem associated with variations fixing the boundary, see (2.5). If it not positive everywhere inside than it must not be the first eigenfunction. Consequently,

$$\dim(W_0^-) + \dim(W_0^0) > 1.$$

Now if Σ is not equatorial, then, by Lemma 2.10, $\dim(H_1) \geq 3$. Hence, by Theorem 3.4, the Morse index is bigger than 4, a contradiction. □

An immediate consequence is the following.

Corollary 3.11. *Let $\Sigma^2 \subset \mathbb{B}^3$ be an embedded FBMS with Morse index 4, then Σ must be star-shaped. In particular, Σ has genus 0.*

Proof. By Prop. 3.10, $\zeta = \langle X, \nu \rangle$ must be positive everywhere inside. As Σ is embedded, it must be star-shaped. The result then follows. □

4. Free Boundary Minimal Annulus

In this section, we study Jacobi fields of the critical catenoid and prove Theorem 1.3. The critical catenoid is the only known example of a free boundary minimal annulus (FBMA) in $\mathbb{B}^3$. That is, it's of genus zero and has two boundary components. Such a surface is described by a conformal harmonic map $\Sigma = X(M)$, for M the cylinder $[-T, T] \times S^1$ with coordinates (t, θ).

For constants c, T to be determined later, the critical catenoid is isometric to the immersion,

$$X(t, \theta) = c(\cosh t \cos\theta, \cosh t \sin\theta, t). \tag{4.1}$$

Consequently, its tangent vector fields are:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= c(\sinh t \cos\theta, \sinh t \sin\theta, 1), \\ X_\theta &= c(-\cosh t \sin\theta, \cosh t \cos\theta, 0). \end{aligned}$$

To satisfy the free boundary conditions, T and c are determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh T &= T \sinh T, \\ c &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T^2 + \cosh^2 T}} = \frac{1}{T \cosh T}. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$T \approx 1.2,\ \cosh T \approx 1.81,\ \sinh T \approx 1.51,\ \tanh T \approx .83.$$

Next, we compute its normal derivative and second fundamental form,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= -\frac{X_t \times X_\theta}{|X_t \times X_\theta|} = \frac{1}{\cosh t}(\cos\theta, \sin\theta, -\sinh t), \\ \langle X, \nu \rangle &= c(1 - \frac{t \sinh t}{\cosh t}), \\ X_{tt} &= c(\cosh t \cos\theta, \cosh t \sin\theta, 0), \\ X_{\theta\theta} &= c(-\cosh t \cos\theta, -\cosh t \sin\theta, 0), \\ A_{tt} = -A_{\theta\theta} &= c, \\ |X_t| = |X_\theta| &= c \cosh t, \\ |A|^2 &= \frac{2}{c^2 \cosh^4 t}. \end{aligned}$$

The normal derivative along the boundary is given by

$$D_\eta = \frac{1}{c \cosh T} D_{\pm t} = T D_{\pm t}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_\eta(X_1) &= \frac{1}{|X_t|}(D_{\pm t} X_1) = \frac{1}{c \cosh T} c \sinh T \cos\theta, \\ &= c \cosh T \cos\theta = X_1. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$D_\eta(X_2) = X_2;\ D_\eta(X_3) = X_3.$$

So coordinate functions are eigenfunctions with Steklov eigenvalue 1 as stated in the introduction. For Jacobi-Steklov eigenvalues, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\eta(\langle X,\nu\rangle) &= \frac{1}{|X_t|}(D_{\pm t}c(1-\frac{t\sinh t}{\cosh t})),\\
&= \frac{-1}{\cosh T}\frac{T+\sinh T\cosh T}{\cosh^2 T} = -\frac{T}{\cosh T},\\
&= -\frac{|A|}{\sqrt{2}};\\
D_\eta(\nu_1) &= \frac{1}{|X_t|}(D_{\pm t}\frac{\cos\theta}{\cosh t}),\\
&= \frac{-\cos\theta}{c\cosh T}\frac{\sinh T}{\cosh^2 T} = \frac{-1}{\cosh T}\cos\theta,\\
&= -\frac{|A|}{\sqrt{2}}X_1 = -\nu_1;\\
D_\eta(\nu_2) &= \frac{1}{|X_t|}(D_{\pm t}\frac{\sin\theta}{\cosh t}) = -\nu_2;\\
D_\eta(-\nu_3) &= \frac{1}{|X_t|}(D_{\pm t}\frac{\sinh t}{\cosh t}),\\
&= \frac{1}{c\cosh T}\frac{\pm 1}{\cosh^2 t},\\
&= \frac{|A|}{\sqrt{2}}X_3 = \frac{1}{\sinh^2 T}(-\nu_3).
\end{aligned}$$

So $\langle X,\nu\rangle \in W_0^0$ and components of the normal vector are eigenfunctions for L_J. Indeed, it is possible to compute all eigenvalues and eigenfunctions in this setting.

The Jacobi operator is

$$J = \Delta_\Sigma + |A|^2 = \frac{1}{c^2\cosh^2 t}(\Delta + \frac{2}{\cosh^2 t}).$$

Consider the following PDE on $M = [-T,T]\times S^1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta + \frac{2}{\cosh^2 t})u = 0,\\
TD_{\pm t}u = \lambda u \text{ where } \{t = \pm T\}.
\end{aligned}$$

As M is rotationally symmetric, the method of separation of variables is applicable. Let $u = f(t)g(\theta)$ then the PDE becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f''}{f} + \frac{g''}{g} = -\frac{2}{\cosh^2 t},\\
Tf' = \lambda f \text{ where } \{t = T\},\\
-Tf' = \lambda f \text{ where } \{t = -T\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since g is a function of θ, $\frac{g''}{g} = -c$. That is, g is an eigenfunction of the Laplacian on $\mathbb{S}^1$. Consequently, $c = n^2$, for non-negative integer n and,

$$\begin{aligned}
g = c_1\cos(n\theta) + c_2\sin(n\theta), \text{ for } n > 0;\\
g = c_1, \text{ for } n = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the PDE is further reduced to,

$$(\partial_t^2 + \frac{2}{\cosh^2 t} - n^2)f = 0, \tag{4.2}$$
$$Tf' = \lambda f \text{ where } \{t = T\},$$
$$-Tf' = \lambda f \text{ where } \{t = -T\}.$$

Let $L_k = \partial_t^2 + \frac{2}{\cosh^2 t} - k$. The analysis of this operator is well known, see for instance [31]. We have, for

$$D^+ = \partial_t + \tanh t,$$
$$D^- = \partial_t - \tanh t,$$

then

$$D^+D^- = \partial_t^2 - 1 := T_0 - 1,$$
$$D^-D^+ = \partial_t^2 + \frac{2}{\cosh^2 t} - 1 = L_0 - 1.$$

Therefore, for $T_k = T_0 - k$,

$$L_k(D^-u) = D^-(T_k(u)),$$
$$T_k(D^+u) = D^+(L_k(u)).$$

The following result is immediate.

Lemma 4.1. *We have the following:*

a. *If u is in the kernel of L_k then D^+u is in the kernel of T_k.*
b. *If u is in the kernel of T_k then D^-u is in the kernel of L_k.*
c. *When $n \neq 1$ then $Ker(L_k) = D^-(Ker(T_k))$.*
d. *When $n = 1$ then $D^+Ker(L_1) = Ker(D^-)$.*

Proof. (a) and (b) are obvious from computation above. For (c), one direction follows immediately from (b). For the reverse, let $u \in \mathrm{Ker}(L_k)$ then, by (a),

$$D^+u = v \in \mathrm{Ker}(T_k).$$

Therefore,

$$D^-(v) = D^-D^+(u) = (L_k + k - 1)(u) = (k - 1)u.$$

When $k \neq 1$, $u \in D^-\mathrm{Ker}(T_k)$.

When $k = 1$, the equation above implies that $D^-(v) = 0$. □

The kernel of $T_k = \partial_t^2 - k$ is standard so Lemma 4.1 gives solutions of (4.2).

Theorem 4.2. *For the critical catenoid given as (4.1), eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of L_J are given by solutions of (4.2) for non-negative integer n. In particular, they are listed below:*

- *For $n = 0$,*

$$u = \tanh t,$$
$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\sinh^2 T} < 1.$$

- *For $n = 1$, there are two cases:*

$$u = (c_1 \cos\theta + c_2 \sin\theta)\frac{1}{\cosh t},$$
$$\lambda = -1;$$
$$u = (c_1 \cos\theta + c_2 \sin\theta)(\sinh t + \frac{t}{\cosh t}),$$
$$\lambda = 1.$$

- *For each $n \geq 2$, there are two cases:*

$$u = (c_1 \cos(n\theta) + c_2 \sin(n\theta))\Big((n - \tanh t)e^{nt} + (n + \tanh t)e^{-nt}\Big),$$
$$\lambda = T\frac{\Big(n(n - \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\Big)e^{kT} - \Big(n(n + \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\Big)e^{-nT}}{(n - \tanh T)e^{nT} + (n + \tanh T)e^{-nT}};$$
$$u = (c_1 \cos(n\theta) + c_2 \sin(n\theta))\Big((n - \tanh t)e^{nt} - (n + \tanh t)e^{-nt}\Big),$$
$$\lambda = T\frac{\Big(n(n - \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\Big)e^{kT} + \Big(n(n + \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\Big)e^{-nT}}{(n - \tanh T)e^{nT} - (n + \tanh T)e^{-nT}}.$$

Proof. When $n = 0$, the solution to (4.2) is given by linear combination of

$$u_1^0 = \tanh t,$$
$$u_2^0 = 1 - t\tanh t.$$

As u_2^0 is a multiple of $\zeta \in W_0^0$ so an eigenfunction is only a multiple of u_1^0. Thus, the eigenvalue is

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\sinh^2 T} < 1.$$

When $n = 1$, we observe that $\mathrm{Ker}(D^-)$ has dimension one. By the method of integrating factors, $\mathrm{Ker}(L_1)$ is given by linear combination of

$$u_1^1 = \frac{1}{\cosh t},$$
$$u_2^1 = \sinh t + \frac{t}{\cosh t}.$$

We compute

$$u = au_1^1 + bu_2^1;$$
$$u' = -\frac{a\sinh t}{\cosh^2 t} + b(\cosh t + \frac{\cosh t - t\sinh t}{\cosh^2 t}),$$
$$u'_{|\partial\Sigma} = -\frac{a\sinh t}{\cosh^2 t} + b\cosh t;$$
$$Tu'_{|T} + Tu'_{|-T} = 2bT\cosh T = \lambda(u_{|T} - u_{|-T}) = 2\lambda b(\sinh T + \frac{T}{\cosh T});$$
$$Tu'_{|T} - Tu'_{|-T} = -2\frac{a}{\cosh T} = \lambda(f'_{|T} + f'_{|-T}) = 2\lambda\frac{a}{\cosh T}.$$

There are 2 cases:

(1) $a \neq 0$, $b = 0$, $\lambda = -1$.
(2) $a = 0$, $b \neq 0$, $\lambda = \frac{T\cosh T}{\sinh T + \frac{T}{\cosh T}} = \frac{T^2\sinh^2 T}{\sinh^2 T + 1} = 1$.

When $n \geq 2$, the solution to (4.2) is given by linear combination of

$$u_1^n = (n - \tanh t)e^{nt},$$
$$u_2^n = (n + \tanh t)e^{-nt}.$$

We compute

$$u = au_1^n + bu_2^n;$$
$$u' = \Big(n(n - \tanh t) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 t}\Big)ae^{nt} - \Big(n(n + \tanh t) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 t}\Big)be^{-nt};$$

$$aTu'_{|T} + bTu'_{|-T} = (a^2 - b^2)Te^{nT}\Big(n(n - \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\Big)$$
$$= \lambda(au_{|T} - bu_{|-T}) = \lambda(a^2 - b^2)e^{nT}(n - \tanh T);$$

$$bTu'_{|T} + aTu'_{|-T} = (a^2 - b^2)Te^{-nT}\Big(n(n + \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 t}\Big)$$
$$= \lambda(bu_{|T} - au_{|-T}) = \lambda(b^2 - a^2)e^{-nT}(n + \tanh T).$$

Thus, $a = \pm b$, and, as a consequence, $u(t) = \pm u(-t)$, and

$$\lambda = \frac{Tu'(T)}{u(T)},$$
$$= T\frac{\Big(n(n - \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\Big)e^{nT} \mp \Big(n(n + \tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\Big)e^{-nT}}{(n - \tanh T)e^{nT} \pm (n + \tanh T)e^{-nT}}.$$

□

Thus we are ready to prove one direction of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 4.3. *The critical catenoid has Morse index 4 and nullity 3.*

Proof. We use the index formula from Theorem 3.4. As the critical catenoid is a polar-graph, $\dim(W_0^-) + \dim(W_0^0) = 1$. It remains to count eigenvalues less than 1 of (4.2).

By Theorem 4.2, for $n \leq 1$, the eigenvalues less than 1 are $\frac{1}{\sinh^2 T}$ of multiplicity 1 and -1 of multiplicity 2.

For $n \geq 2$, we consider

$$f(n) = \frac{(Tn - 1)(n - \tanh T) - \frac{T}{\cosh^2(T)}}{(Tn + 1)(n + \tanh T) - \frac{T}{\cosh^2(T)}}\frac{e^{nT}}{e^{-nT}}.$$

The first ratio could be rewritten as,

$$\frac{(Tn - 1)(n - \tanh T) - \frac{T}{\cosh^2(T)}}{(Tn + 1)(n + \tanh T) - \frac{T}{\cosh^2(T)}} = \frac{Tn^2 - n(1 + T\tanh T) + \tanh T - \frac{T}{\cosh^2(T)}}{Tn^2 + n(1 + T\tanh T) + \tanh T - \frac{T}{\cosh^2(T)}},$$
$$= \frac{an^2 - bn + c}{an^2 + bn + c}.$$

Recall, $T\sinh T = \cosh T$ and

$$T \approx 1.19968,\ \cosh T \approx 1.81,\ \sinh T \approx 1.51,\ \tanh T \approx .83.$$

Thus,

$$a \approx 1.2,\ b = 2,\ c \approx .4674$$

Then it follows that $g(n) = \frac{an^2-bn+c}{an^2+bn+c} > \frac{1}{k}$ for $n \geq 2$ if,

$$(4a+c)(k-1) - 4(k+1) > 0,$$

$$a + \frac{c}{4} - 1 > \frac{2}{k-1}.$$

In particular, we could choose $k = 11$.

On the other hand, for $n \geq 2$, $f(n) = g(n)\frac{e^{nT}}{e^{-nT}} = g(n)e^{2nT} > 54g(n)$. Thus, for $n \geq 2$,

$$T\frac{\left(n(n-\tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\right)e^{nT} - \left(n(n+\tanh T) - \frac{1}{\cosh^2 T}\right)e^{-nT}}{(n-\tanh T)e^{nT} + (n+\tanh T)e^{-nT}} > 1.$$

As the other eigenvalue is even bigger, all eigenvalues for $n \geq 2$ from Theorem 4.2 are bigger than 1. So we conclude that the catenoid has Morse index 4.

For nullity, by Theorem 3.7, we count ζ and eigenfunctions with eigenvalue 1 of 4.2. The eigenvalue 1 has multiplicity 2 by Theorem 4.2 so the result follows. □

Now we are ready to finish the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof. One direction follows from the Theorem 4.3.

For the converse, note that index 4 implies the first Steklov eigenvalue 1 by Prop 3.9. Then [11, Theorem 6.6] implies that the surface must be the critical catenoid. □

Finally, recall that for $M \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$, non-trivial $\langle MX, \nu\rangle$ gives an eigenfunction of L_J with eigenvalue 1. And the function is trivial if and only if Σ is rotationally symmetric. Thus, it is possible to characterize the critical catenoid by its nullity.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\Sigma^k \subset \mathbb{B}^{k+1}$ be a FBMS. Then it has (free boundary) nullity 3 if and only if $k = 2$ and Σ is a critical catenoid.*

References

[1] Lucas Ambrozio, Alessandro Carlotto, and Ben Sharp. Index estimates for free boundary minimal hypersurfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.09704*, 2016.

[2] W. Arendt, A. F. M. ter Elst, J. B. Kennedy, and M. Sauter. The Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator via hidden compactness. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(3):1757–1786, 2014.

[3] Wolfgang Arendt and Rafe Mazzeo. Friedlander's eigenvalue inequalities and the Dirichlet-to-Neumann semigroup. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 11(6):2201–2212, 2012.

[4] Jingyi Chen, Ailana Fraser, and Chao Pang. Minimal immersions of compact bordered Riemann surfaces with free boundary. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(4):2487–2507, 2015.

[5] R. Courant. The existence of minimal surfaces of given topological structure under prescribed boundary conditions. *Acta Math.*, 72:51–98, 1940.

[6] Baptiste Devyver. Index of the critical catenoid. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02315*, 2016.

[7] Ulrich Dierkes, Stefan Hildebrandt, and Anthony J. Tromba. *Regularity of minimal surfaces*, volume 340 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, second edition, 2010. With assistance and contributions by A. Küster.

[8] Ailana Fraser. Index estimates for minimal surfaces and k-convexity. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 135(11):3733–3744, 2007.

[9] Ailana Fraser and Richard Schoen. The first Steklov eigenvalue, conformal geometry, and minimal surfaces. *Adv. Math.*, 226(5):4011–4030, 2011.

[10] Ailana Fraser and Richard Schoen. Uniqueness theorems for free boundary minimal disks in space forms. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (17):8268–8274, 2015.

[11] Ailana Fraser and Richard Schoen. Sharp eigenvalue bounds and minimal surfaces in the ball. *Invent. Math.*, 203(3):823–890, 2016.

[12] Brian Freidin, Mamikon Gulian, and Peter McGrath. Free boundary minimal surfaces in the unit ball with low cohomogeneity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.07588*, 2016.
[13] J. D. Gergonne. Questions résolues. Considérations préliminaires. *Ann. Math. Pures Appl. [Ann. Gergonne]*, 7:143–147, 1816/17.
[14] M. Grüter and J. Jost. On embedded minimal disks in convex bodies. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 3(5):345–390, 1986.
[15] Michael Grüter and Jürgen Jost. Allard type regularity results for varifolds with free boundaries. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 13(1):129–169, 1986.
[16] Stefan Hildebrandt and Johannes C. C. Nitsche. Optimal boundary regularity for minimal surfaces with a free boundary. *Manuscripta Math.*, 33(3-4):357–364, 1980/81.
[17] Willi Jäger. Behavior of minimal surfaces with free boundaries. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 23:803–818, 1970.
[18] Hans Lewy. On mimimal surfaces with partially free boundary. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 4:1–13, 1951.
[19] Martin Man-chun Li. A general existence theorem for embedded minimal surfaces with free boundary. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 68(2):286–331, 2015.
[20] Fernando C. Marques and André Neves. Min-max theory and the Willmore conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 179(2):683–782, 2014.
[21] Davi Maximo, Ivaldo Nunes, and Graham Smith. Free boundary minimal annuli in convex three-manifolds, to appear in j. *Differential Geom.*
[22] William H. Meeks, III and Shing Tung Yau. Topology of three-dimensional manifolds and the embedding problems in minimal surface theory. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 112(3):441–484, 1980.
[23] A. Ros. Stability of minimal and constant mean curvature surfaces with free boundary. *Mat. Contemp.*, 35:221–240, 2008.
[24] Pam Sargent. Index bounds for free boundary minimal surfaces of convex bodies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.09143*, 2016.
[25] HA Schwarz. Fortgesetzte untersuchungen über specielle minimalflächen. In *Gesammelte Mathematische Abhandlungen*, pages 126–148. Springer, 1890.
[26] James Simons. Minimal varieties in riemannian manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 88:62–105, 1968.
[27] Graham Smith and Detang Zhou. The morse index of the critical catenoid. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.01485*, 2016.
[28] B. Smyth. Stationary minimal surfaces with boundary on a simplex. *Invent. Math.*, 76(3):411–420, 1984.
[29] M. Struwe. On a free boundary problem for minimal surfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 75(3):547–560, 1984.
[30] Francisco Urbano. Minimal surfaces with low index in the three-dimensional sphere. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 108(4):989–992, 1990.
[31] David Wiygul. Minimal surfaces in the 3-sphere by stacking clifford tori. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.07420*, 2015.
[32] Rugang Ye. On the existence of area-minimizing surfaces with free boundary. *Math. Z.*, 206(3):321–331, 1991.

Department of Mathematics, UCI, Irvine, CA 92697
E-mail address: hungtt1@math.uci.edu